



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,302	10/11/2001	John David Laughlin	10007788-1	1847

7590 03/20/2008
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

DEBROW, JAMES J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/976,302

Applicant(s)

LAUGHLIN, JOHN DAVID

Examiner

JAMES J. DEBROW

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 11, 12, 18, 19 and 22-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5, 11, 12, 18, 19 and 22-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Appeal Brief filed 06 Dec. 2007.
2. Claims 2-5, 11, 12, 18, 19 and 22-33 are pending in this case. Claims 2, 11, 18, 25, 32 and 33 are independent claims.

Reopening of Prosecution After Appeal Brief or Reply Brief

3. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 06 Dec. 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new grounds of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 2-5, 11, 12, 18, 19, 25-27, and 29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naik et al. (hereinafter "Naik") (Patent No.: US 5,579,446, Date of Patent: Nov. 26, 1996) in view of Terasaka (Patent No.: US 6,236,462 B1; Filed: Oct. 1, 1998).**

Regarding independent claim 2, Naik discloses a printer driver stored on a computer-readable medium comprising:

an interface configured to receive print job data (fig. 1; Naik discloses an interface configured to receive print job data.).

a print job formatting routine which notes one or more regions within a print job derived from the print job data and further specifies a particular print quality level at which each such region is then printed (figs. 2-3, 5, 7; col. 3 lines 29-42; col. 5 lines 23-33; col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16; Naik discloses a user interface with options for controlling two separate print-quality characteristics, allowing different print-

quality modes for formatting different type of objects to be printed in the same document.).

Naik does not expressly disclose a *WYSIWYG display routine for generating a WYSIWYG display of the print job; and*

a user input routine for receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by the user.

Terasaka teaches a *WYSIWYG display routine for generating a WYSIWYG display of said print job* (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of a print job on a WYSIWYG display.).

a user input routine for receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by the user (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; col. 6, lines 9-14; col. 7, lines 31-35; col. 8, lines 29-31; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of form data of a print job. Information specifying the print format is appended to the form data, which is

the same data as the print setting. Terasaka further teaches partial printing, which the Examiner concludes is analogous to regions within a print job as they both define printing regions of a document and not printing the entire document. Thus specifying the print format of form data regarding partial printing thereby teaches a user input routine for receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by the user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Terasaka with Naik for the benefit providing a WYSIWYG system which allows the user to see the image on the display screen he will see when it when it is printed (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Naik discloses an *input routine configured to receive user input specifying a particular print quality level for each of the one or more regions defined within the print job* in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16, and col. 10 lines 44-57.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Naik discloses *receiving user input routine configured to receive user input through a mouse connected to a host computer on which the printer driver is running* in fig. 1.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Naik does not disclose expressly *wherein the user input routine is configured to display movement of a cursor on the WYSIWYG display in response to physical movement of the mouse, the movement of the cursor being used by the user input routine to define the one or more regions within the print job.*

Terasaka teaches *wherein the user input routine is configured to display movement of a cursor on the WYSIWYG display in response to physical movement of the mouse, the movement of the cursor being used by the user input routine to define the one or more regions within the print job* (It has been established and is well known in the art that that WYSIWYG display system is configured to display movement of a cursor on the WYSIWYG display in response to physical movement of the mouse, the movement of the cursor being used by the user input.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Terasaka with Naik for the benefit providing a WYSIWYG system which allows the user to see the image on the display screen he will see when it when it is printed (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Regarding independent claim 11, Naik discloses *a method of printing documents comprising printing designated regions within a print job at different print quality levels, said method further comprising* (figs. 2-3, 5, 7; col. 3 lines 29-42; col. 5 lines 23-33; col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16; Naik discloses a user interface with options for controlling two separate print-quality characteristics, allowing

different print-quality modes for formatting different type of objects to be printed in the same document.):

Naik does not disclose expressly *displaying a WYSIWYG display of the print job;*
and

receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by a user.

Terasaka teaches *displaying a WYSIWYG display of the print job* (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of a print job on a WYSIWYG display.).

receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by a user (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; col. 6, lines 9-14; col. 7, lines 31-35; col. 8, lines 29-31; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of form data of a print job. Information specifying the print format is appended to the form data, which is the same data as the print setting. Terasaka further teaches partial printing, which the Examiner concludes is

analogous to regions within a print job as they both define printing regions of a document and not printing the entire document. Thus specifying the print format of form data regarding partial printing thereby teaches a user input routine for receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by the user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Terasaka with Naik for the benefit providing a WYSIWYG system which allows the user to see the image on the display screen he will see when it when it is printed (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Regarding dependent claim 12, Naik does not disclose expressly *the method of claim 11, further comprising specifying said one or more regions within a print job by moving a cursor driven by a mouse over said WYSIWYG display.*

Terasaka teaches *specifying said one or more regions within a print job by moving a cursor driven by a mouse over said WYSIWYG display* (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; col. 6, lines 9-14; col. 7, lines 31-35; col. 8, lines 29-31; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of form data of a print job. Information specifying the print format is appended to the form data, which is the same data as the print setting. Terasaka further teaches partial printing, which the Examiner concludes is analogous to regions within a

print job as they both define printing regions of a document and not printing the entire document. Further, it has been established and is well known in the art that that WYSIWYG display system is configured to display movement of a cursor on the WYSIWYG display in response to physical movement of the mouse, the movement of the cursor being used by the user input.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Terasaka with Naik for the benefit providing a WYSIWYG system which allows the user to see the image on the display screen he will see when it when it is printed (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Regarding independent claim 18, Naik discloses a computer system comprising:

a host computer (45 Fig. 1);

an interface on said host computer for connecting a printing device to said host computer (Fig. 1); and

a printer driver stored on said host computer for formatting print job data from said host computer to a printing device; wherein said printer driver comprises a print job formatting routine which notes one or more regions within a print job derived from print job data and further specifies a particular print quality level at which each such region is to be printed (2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, and col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16); and

Naik does not disclose expressly *wherein said print driver further comprises: a WYSIWYG display routine for generating a WYSIWYG display of the print job; and a user input routine for receiving user input defining said one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by a user.*

Terasaka teaches a *WYSIWYG display routine for generating a WYSIWYG display of said print job* (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of a print job on a WYSIWYG display.).

a user input routine for receiving user input defining said one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by a user (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; col. 6, lines 9-14; col. 7, lines 31-35; col. 8, lines 29-31; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of form data of a print job. Information specifying the print format is appended to the form data, which is the same data as the print setting. Terasaka further teaches partial printing, which the Examiner concludes is analogous to regions within a print job as they both define

printing regions of a document and not printing the entire document. Thus specifying the print format of form data regarding partial printing thereby teaches a user input routine for receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by the user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Terasaka with Naik for the benefit providing a WYSIWYG system which allows the user to see the image on the display screen he will see when it when it is printed (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Regarding dependent claim 19, Naik discloses *wherein the user input routine is configured to receive user input specifying a particular print quality level for each of the one or more regions defined within the print job* (figs. 2-3, 5, 7; col. 3 lines 29-42; col. 5 lines 23-33; col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16; Naik discloses a user interface with options for controlling two separate print-quality characteristics, allowing different print-quality modes for formatting different type of objects to be printed in the same document.).

Regarding independent claim 25, Naik discloses *a printer driver stored on a computer-readable medium comprising:*

an interface configured to receive print job data (fig. 1; Naik discloses an interface configured to receive print job data.);

a user interface with which a user designates one or more specific region of a print job represented by said print job data (Figs. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5, lines 23-33, col. 5, lines 58-65, and col. 6, line 61 – col. 7, line 16.); and

a print job formatting routine which notes said one or more regions within said print job and further specifies a particular print quality level at which each such region is then printed (figs. 2-3, 5, 7; col. 3 lines 29-42; col. 5 lines 23-33; col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16; Naik discloses a user interface with options for controlling two separate print-quality characteristics, allowing different print-quality modes for formatting different type of objects to be printed in the same document.).

Naik does not disclose expressly wherein user input through said user interface can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by a user.

Terasaka teaches wherein user input through said user interface can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by a user (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; col. 6, lines 9-14; col. 7, lines 31-35; col. 8, lines 29-31; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of form data of a print job. Information specifying the print format is appended to the form data, which is the

same data as the print setting. Terasaka further teaches partial printing, which the Examiner concludes is analogous to regions within a print job as they both define printing regions of a document and not printing the entire document. Thus specifying the print format of form data regarding partial printing thereby teaches a user input routine for receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by the user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Terasaka with Naik for the benefit providing a WYSIWYG system which allows the user to see the image on the display screen he will see when it is printed (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Regarding dependent claim 26, Naik does not disclose *expressly the printer driver of claim 25, wherein said user interface comprises a WYSIWYG display of said print job.*

Terasaka teaches *wherein said user interface comprises a WYSIWYG display of said print job* (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of a print job on a WYSIWYG display.)

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Terasaka with Naik for the benefit providing a WYSIWYG system which allows the user to see the image on the display screen he will see when it when it is printed (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Regarding dependent claim 27, Naik discloses *the printer driver of claim 25, wherein said interface comprises a mouse moving a cursor on a display of said print job, wherein clicking and dragging said cursor on said display designates a region of said print job* (Figs. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, and col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16. The user can manipulate the text, graphics, and photo image regions of the document using the mouse cursor.);

Further, Terasaka teaches *wherein the user input routine is configured to display movement of a cursor on the WYSIWYG display in response to physical movement of the mouse, the movement of the cursor being used by the user input routine to define the one or more regions within the print job* (It has been established and is well known in the art that that WYSIWYG display system is configured to display movement of a cursor on the WYSIWYG display in response to physical movement of the mouse, the movement of the cursor being used by the user input.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Terasaka with Naik for the benefit providing a WYSIWYG system which allows the user to see the image on the display screen he will see when it when it is printed (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Regarding dependent claim 29, Naik teaches *wherein the print job formatting routine prompts a user to input a print quality level setting for at least one of the regions* in fig. 2 and 5.

Regarding dependent claim 30, Naik teaches *wherein the print job formatting routine prompts a user to input a print quality level setting for at least one of the regions* in fig. 2 and 5.

Regarding dependent claim 31, Naik teaches *wherein the print job formatting routine prompts a user to input a print quality level setting for at least one of the regions* in fig. 2 and 5.

Regarding independent claim 32, Naik discloses *a printer driver stored on a computer-readable medium comprising:*

an interface configured to receive print job data (Fig. 1; Naik discloses an interface configured to receive print job data.).

a print job formatting routine which notes said one or more regions within said print job derived from said print job and further specifies a particular print quality level at which each such region is then printed (figs. 2-3, 5, 7; col. 3 lines 29-42; col. 5 lines 23-33; col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16; Naik discloses a user interface with options for controlling two separate print-quality characteristics, allowing different print-

quality modes for formatting different type of objects to be printed in the same document.).

Naik does not disclose expressly *a display routine for generating a display of said print job; and*

a user input routine for receiving user input defining said one or more regions within said print job using said display, wherein user input through said user interface can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by a user.

Terasaka teaches *a display routine for generating a display of said print job* (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of a print job on a WYSIWYG display.).

a user input routine for receiving user input defining said one or more regions within said print job using said display, wherein user input through said user interface can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by a user (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; col. 6, lines 9-14; col. 7, lines 31-35; col. 8, lines 29-31; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of form data of a print job. Information specifying the print format is appended to the form data, which is the same data as the print setting. Terasaka further teaches partial printing,

which the Examiner concludes is analogous to regions within a print job as they both define printing regions of a document and not printing the entire document. Thus specifying the print format of form data regarding partial printing thereby teaches a user input routine for receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by the user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Terasaka with Naik for the benefit providing a WYSIWYG system which allows the user to see the image on the display screen he will see when it when it is printed (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Regarding independent claim 33, Naik discloses *a method of printing documents comprising printing designated regions within a print job at different print quality levels, said method further comprising* (figs. 2-3, 5, 7; col. 3 lines 29-42; col. 5 lines 23-33; col. 5 lines 58-65, col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16; Naik discloses a user interface with options for controlling two separate print-quality characteristics, allowing different print-quality modes for formatting different type of objects to be printed in the same document.).

Naik does not disclose expressly *displaying a display of said print job; and*

receiving user input defining one or more regions within said print job using said display, wherein user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by a user.

Terasaka teaches *displaying a display of said print job* (col. 3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of a print job on a WYSIWYG display.).

receiving user input defining one or more regions within said print job using said display, wherein user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by a user (col.

3, lines 48-65; col. 4, lines 28-34; col. 6, lines 9-14; col. 7, lines 31-35; col. 8, lines 29-31; Terasaka teaches a WYSIWYG system which contains a preview creating section that creates a print preview of form data of a print job. Information specifying the print format is appended to the form data, which is the same data as the print setting.

Terasaka further teaches partial printing, which the Examiner concludes is analogous to regions within a print job as they both define printing regions of a document and not printing the entire document. Thus specifying the print format of form data regarding partial printing thereby teaches a user input routine for receiving user input defining the one or more regions within the print job using the WYSIWYG display, wherein the user input can selectively define any portion of said print job as a said region with an

Art Unit: 2176

independent-specified print quality level, said regions including or excluding any particular element or elements of said print job as desired by the user.).

Therefore at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Terasaka with Naik for the benefit providing a WYSIWYG system which allows the user to see the image on the display screen he will see when it when it is printed (col. 3, lines 60-65).

Note

6. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

7. **Claims 22, 23, 24, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naik in view of Terasaka, further in view of Nicoloff, Jr. et al. (hereinafter "Nicoloff") (Patent No.: US 6,017,113, Patent of Date: Jan. 25, 2000).**

Regarding dependent claim 22, Naik discloses defining variable print quality for a plurality of regions in a document in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, and col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16.

Naik in view of Terasaka does not disclose expressly *the print quality level is defined by pixels per unit distance*.

Nicoloff teaches a printer capable of mixed print quality *wherein print quality is defined by pixels per distance* in col. 2 line 41 – col. 3 line 26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have combined Nicoloff with the teachings of Naik in view of Terasaka to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have printed different regions at different resolutions because the different types of regions, such as monochrome versus color portions, in a document have different resolution requirements as taught by Nicoloff in col. 3 lines 17-26.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Naik teaches defining variable print quality for a plurality of regions in a document in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, and col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16.

Naik in view of Terasaka does not disclose expressly *the print quality level is defined by pixels per unit distance*.

Nicoloff teaches a printer capable of mixed print quality *wherein print quality is defined by pixels per distance* in col. 2 line 41 – col. 3 line 26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have combined Nicoloff with the teachings of Naik in view of Terasaka to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have printed different regions at different resolutions because the different types of regions, such as monochrome versus color portions, in a document have different resolution requirements as taught by Nicoloff in col. 3 lines 17-26.

Regarding dependent claim 24, Naik teaches defining variable print quality for a plurality of regions in a document in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, and col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16.

Naik in view of Terasaka does not disclose expressly *the print quality level is defined by pixels per unit distance*.

Nicoloff teaches a printer capable of mixed print quality *wherein print quality is defined by pixels per distance* in col. 2 line 41 – col. 3 line 26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have combined Nicoloff with the teachings of Naik in view of Terasaka to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have printed different regions at different resolutions because the different types of regions, such as monochrome versus color portions, in a document have different resolution requirements as taught by Nicoloff in col. 3 lines 17-26.

Regarding dependent claim 28, Naik discloses defining variable print quality for a plurality of regions in a document in fig. 2-3, 5, 7, col. 5 lines 23-33, col. 5 lines 58-65, and col. 6 line 61 – col. 7 line 16.

Naik in view of Terasaka does not disclose expressly *the print quality level is defined by pixels per unit distance*.

Nicoloff teaches a printer capable of mixed print quality *wherein print quality is defined by pixels per distance* in col. 2 line 41 – col. 3 line 26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have combined Nicoloff with the teachings of Naik in view of Terasaka to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have printed different regions at different resolutions because the different types of regions, such as monochrome versus color portions, in a document have different resolution requirements as taught by Nicoloff in col. 3 lines 17-26.

Note

8. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the reference should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments, see Appeal Brief, filed 06 Dec. 2007 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Naik, Terasaka and Nicoloff.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James J. Debrow whose telephone number is 571-272-5768. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2176

JAMES DEBROW
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2176

/Doug Hutton/
Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100